

REMARKS:

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-15, 17, and 18 are pending in the application. By this amendment, all claims are amended solely to remove reference numbers from the claims. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

All pending claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite due to certain seemingly conflicting reference numerals included in the claims. Applicant has removed all reference numerals from the claims to obviate the rejection. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

All pending claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) based on Dimberg, U.S. 1,641,745, in view of Havard et al., U.S. 5,483,034. The Examiner relies on Dimberg for teaching the components and geometric arrangement of the components recited in the claims, which are directed to a method of assembling such components to produce a stator or rotor component. In particular, the Examiner construes the lacing strips 4 in Dimberg as the claim-recited first wall part, and he construes the blades 2 in Dimberg as the claim-recited second wall part. The Examiner relies on Havard for teaching laser-welding from an opposite side so as to yield a T-shaped joint. Applicant traverses the rejection because Dimberg fails to teach many of the limitations recited in the independent claim – because of that, Applicant does not need to address the dependent claims specifically – and Havard does not remedy that deficiency.

First, in Dimberg, the lacing strips 4 (the alleged first wall part) do not bear against flat sides of the blades 2 (the alleged second wall part). Rather, they fit into notches formed in the leading edges of the blades. See page 2, lines 13-17 (“The lacing strips 4 after being applied in notches in the blades 2 . . .”).

Second, given the limited width of the lacing strips 4, as shown in Figures 2 and 4, it is hard to accept that they extend meaningfully in the axial direction (into the page in Figures 1 and 3; to the right in Figures 2 and 4).

Third, given the overlapping arrangement of the blades 2, the only conceivable way the lacing strips 4 could be laser-welded to the edges of the blades would be from the front to the back, i.e., into the plane of the page as shown in Figures 2 and 4. That would be from an axial direction, not from a circumferential direction.

Fourth, given the limited width of the lacing strips 4 and their edge-to-edge contact with the blades 2, it is not understood how laser-welding the parts together would yield a T-shaped joint.

Fifth, given the limited width of the lacing strips 4, as shown in Figures 2 and 4, they do not define a meaningfully extending (in the axial direction) flow-guiding surface that delimits a gas duct. Rather, the most that could be said is that the lacing strips 4 separate an almost planar region of space right at the leading edges of the blades 2 into radially inner and radially outer portions.

Thus, the combination of Dimberg and Havard does not yield the invention as defined in independent claim 1 or, accordingly, any of the dependent claims. Therefore, Applicant traverses the rejection and requests that it be withdrawn.

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1437, referencing Attorney Docket No.: 7589.049.NPUS01.

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner may directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP
1000 Louisiana, Suite 5300
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 571-3400
(713) 456-2836 (fax)
tracy.druce@novakdruce.com

Respectfully submitted,

/Kenneth M. Fagin/

Kenneth M. Fagin, Esq.
Reg. No. 37,615
ken.fagin@novakdruce.com